



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JGJr: 02-04

Paper No: 9

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
805 Third Avenue
New York NY 10022

COPY MAILED

FEB 2 0 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of: :
Cote, et al. :
Filed: 25 June, 2001. : ON PETITION
Application No. 09/891,875 :
Docket No.: 03795/000J514-US0 :

This is a decision on the petition submitted on 12 December, 2003, to withdraw the holding of abandonment, and properly considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.181.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

BACKGROUND

A review of the record reveals:

- it appeared that Petitioner failed to respond timely and properly to Confirming Letter Regarding a Request for Information mailed on 7 March, 2003, with reply due on or before 12 March, 2003;
- the instant application went abandoned after midnight 12 March, 2003;
- Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 17 November, 2003;
- on 12 December, 2003, Petitioner filed, inter alia, a request for withdrawal of the holding of abandonment, along with documents purporting to be a copy of the reply (confirmation of translation) with a FAX transmission certificate and transmission confirmation dated 10 March, 2003).

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).¹

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶))

As to the Request to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment

The courts have determined the construct for properly supporting a petition seeking withdrawal

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:
35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.
Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

² Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁵ See: *Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment*, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office *supra*.

⁶ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

of a holding of abandonment.⁷

Petitioner contends and evidences timely reply.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Petitioner satisfied the burdens set forth in Delgar v. Schulyer, and the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 hereby is **granted** and the 17 November, 2003, Notice of Abandonment is **vacated** and fees in connection with this petition are waived.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁷ See: Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971).